Date: 12/19/2004

First Name: Graceann

Last Name: Jackson

Address: 3740 Evans St. City: Los Angeles

State: CA

Zip Code: 90027

Topic: Air Quality

Comments: The gas we are using right now in our cars is far worse to our

environment than natural gas could ever be. We have been searching for a new source of fuel that will be safer to the environment and I believe we have found it. Since natural gas is not in great supply in our state, I know that we need to have it transported to us from another country. I believe that cabrillo port is the safest way to accomplish this and with the growing concern of our air quality we need to focus on using this clean burning

fuel.

2004/G235

G235-1

Date: 12/16/2004

First Name: Brandon Last Name: Jacobs

Address: 4820 Coldwater Canyon Avenue

Apt 207

City: Sherman Oaks

State: CA

Zip Code: 91423

Topic: Alternatives

Comments: California is my home, and I am proud to say I live in the golden state of

California – a gem whose beauty is the envy of the world. I want this beauty to be preserved not only for me, but for future generations.

I strongly support conservation measures, and the development of renewable energy sources like wind, solar and fuel cells.

While our future may be filled with renewable energy sources, we can't look past our short term need for energy that must be met.

That is why I support Cabrillo Port. Cabrillo Port is a clean, safe, reliable, cost-effective source of energy that will meet our needs in the short term as these other technologies develop.

The other alternative? We could see another energy crisis like we did a few years ago – with price spikes and blackouts.

Not only will Cabrillo Port prevent another energy shortage, it will infuse millions of dollars into our local economy. The project will also be so far at sea, that we won't even know it is there.

"Yes" we should continue developing renewable energy as part of our long term plan. And "Yes" we should support Cabrillo Port as a short-term strategy to meet our energy needs now, and for future generations."

2004/G046

G046-1

Date: 12/20/2004

First Name: Chris

Last Name: Jacobs

Address: 16038 SW Mason Lane

City: Beaverton

State: OR

Zip Code: 97006

Topic: Energy and Minerals

Comments: I'm tired of hearing environmentalists whine about projects that contribute

to the national economy like the recently proposed LNG facility. Not only has LNG gone above and beyond to provide for safety and aesthetics (floating storage facility) but it is a good way to conserve some of our resources here at home. I think that California needs this facility more than anyone to help reduce the blackouts and energy crises they are

experiencing.

Please approve this project.

2004/G379

G379-1

LAZER BROADCASTING CORPORATION

200 SOUTH A STREET * 4th FLOOR * OXNARD, CA 93030 * P.O. BOX 6940 TEL. (805) 240-2070 * FAX (805) 240-5960

KXLM 102.9 PM OXNARD

KCZN 96.7 FM SANTA PAULA

KOXR AM 910 OXNARD

KXRS 105.7 PM RIVERSIDE

KXSB 161,7 PM SAN BERNARDING

K\$BQ AM 1480 SANTA MARIA

KLMM 94.1 FM MORRO BAY

KLUN 103.1 PM PASO ROBLES

KBTW 104.5 PM BARSTOW

KCAL AM 1410 REDLANDS

51GLO 21 NEWSPAPER

KZER AM 1250 SANTA BARBARA

KSRN 107.7 PM KINGS BEACH December 14, 2004

Docket Management Facility U.S. Department of Transportation Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street SW Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Clearinghouse California State Lands Commission 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South Sacramento, CA 95825

RE: Federal Docket Number USCG-2004-16877 - 6/0

To U.S. Department of Transportation and California State Lands Commission:

I have lived and worked in Oxnard for more than 13 years and I am very proud to call it my home.

Over the years, I have seen a lot of growth here in Oxnard and in Ventura County. A lot of it has been good with more homes for our working families, eponomic development to bring more investment into our city and an increase in tourism that will bring more dollars to our local economy.

Even more, Ventura County's population is expected to increase more than 30 percent by 2030, 30 percent! With all of these changes and growth, one has to wonder will we have enough natural gas to meet our current needs let alone our future needs?

Absolutely, with liquefied natural gas and through Cabrillo Port. I support Cabrillo Port.

We really need to consider the facts and nothing but the facts when we consider Cabrillo

I believe our community will be safe as I have full confidence that the experts from the United States Coast Guard, United States Maritime Administration and California State Lands Commission put public safety first when they released the environmental impact report.

So, it is important for all of us to not let a few individuals talk for the rest of us with their misinformation, but rather read the report for ourselves and come to our own conclusion.

As for me, I support Cabrillo Port and hope that you will grant the necessary approvals to build it.

Cerry Janis

G396-1

309412

Saul Janson 826 Warren Avenue Venice, CA 90291

December 8, 2004

Mr. Cy Oggins California State Lands Commission 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South Sacramento, CA 95825

USCE-2004-16877-737

Dear Sir:

My name is Saul Janson. I am here tonight as a concerned citizen who lives on the coast. I'm also an attorney and concerned about environmental issues. First of all I'd like to thank you for coming to our community to hear what we have to say. All too often, projects like the one being discussed tonight are developed and imposed on a community without the slightest input from the people who will be most effected by them.

If we are going to have an LNG facility in our backyard—or "backpool" as the case is, I want to encourage you to look at the following:

The plant should be far enough offshore to protect us from potential explosions

The plant and LNG process should not in any way encourage the continued development of oil
exploration off the coast by using existing platforms as transfer stations; the facility should use
a new platform which can be dismantled when the time comes.

The Santa Barbara/Channel Islands must be totally protected and not disturbed G527-3 G527-4

The plant should be outside of major shipping lanes

Any onshore processing or facilities must also protect the health and welfare of the residents

Protection of the natural habitat must be a priority
 G527-6

I understand the need for LNG and it does appear to be a cleaner alternative than oil and other products, but it's important that LNG development is viewed as an interim measure as we continue to look for alternative ways to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

I have heard a lot about these and other projects, and I strongly believe that we need to do all we can to protect this beautiful area that we live in and our local economy which, as you know, depends so

I encourage your company to hold more of these meetings to give the community a chance to voice our opinions and concerns and stay involved in the process all along the way. Also, I encourage your company to reach out to others who were unable to attend this hearing and make sure they are fully aware of every aspect of this proposal.

I will also work to see that our elected officials exercise their influence and oversight to ensure that any promises made are promises kept.

G527-9

Sincerely,

Saul Janson

heavily on tourism.

RE: Docket Number 16877

2004/G527

G527-1

Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical miles (6.5 miles) from the shoreline. Figure ES-1 depicts the consequence distances surrounding the FSRU location for worst credible events.

G527-2

This Project is not associated in any way with platforms associated with offshore oil development. The U.S Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service has jurisdiction over all offshore oil development. Section 2.8.1 contains information on removal of the FSRU upon decommissioning.

G527-3

G527-5

G527-7

G527-8

Sections 4.7, 4.13, 4.15, 4.18 and 4.20 contain information on resources and potential impacts and mitigation to reduce impacts on the Santa Barbara/Channel Islands. Figure ES-1 depicts the consequence distances surrounding the FSRU location for worst credible events.

G527-4

LNG carriers approaching and departing the Cabrillo Port FSRU would travel on the routes depicted in Figure 4.3-2 (also see Section 4.3.1.3). LNG carriers would neither cross nor enter the Santa Barbara Channel coastwise traffic lanes under normal operating conditions. The FSRU would be located about 2 nautical miles from the southbound coastwise traffic lane. Given this distance, its presence, under normal operating conditions, would not interfere with operations in the coastwise traffic lanes.

LNG carriers and commercial vessels longer than 65 feet (20 m) would be equipped with an automatic identification system (AIS) so that they would be able to detect other LNG carriers and other vessels. Also, LNG carriers would be responsible for adhering to the "rules of the road" for ship traffic. Section 4.3.1.4 describes safety measures to be used.

G527-5

As described in Chapter 2, LNG would only be present on LNG carriers and on the FSRU, which would be located 12.01 nautical



2004/G527

miles offshore. LNG would be regasified offshore and transmitted as natural gas through subsea pipelines to onshore pipelines.

Section 4.2.8 contains information on safety requirements for pipelines. Section 4.13.1 discusses the proximity of the proposed pipeline routes to residences and schools.

G527-6

Section 4.7 discusses marine biological impacts, and Section 4.8 discusses terrestrial biological impacts.

G527-7

Section 1.2 discusses dependence on foreign energy sources.

G527-8

Section 1.1 discusses regulations and agencies involved in the licensing and potential approval of the proposed Project. The USCG and MARAD will hold a final public hearing on the license with a 45-day comment period before the Federal Record of Decision is issued. The CSLC also will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease.

Section 1.5 contains additional information regarding public notification and opportunities for public comment.

G527-9

Date: 12/18/2004

First Name: holly

Last Name: jensen

Title: wife

Address: 1204 Oliver Ave

City: San Diego

State: CA

Zip Code: 92109

Phone No.: 858-270-8142

Email hollyhake@hotmail.com

Address:

Topic: Energy and Minerals

Comments: It's time California starts producing more energy and power to meet the

growing needs of our state.

2004/G167

G167-1

Date: 12/20/2004

First Name: Robin

Last Name: Johnson

Address: 2935 Temescal Ave

City: Norco

State: CA

Zip Code: 92860

Topic: Energy and Minerals

Comments: California is one of the most expensive states in the nation to live.

Californians are such NIMBY's they create this expense themselves. As a single mother I can not afford to live in this state -- let's change this and

start processing more energy products. I support this project.

2004/G329

G329-1

Date: 12/19/2004

First Name: Adam

Last Name: Jones

Address: 24877 Walnut st. City: Santa Clarita

State: CA

Zip Code: 91321

Topic: Alternatives

Comments: I would like to start by saying that I'm very confident that natural gas is going to play a very important role in our states future. I feel that with the

depleting domestic sources and reserves of natural gas we will become even more dependent on foreign sources of natural gas. I believe that Australia is a great source of natural gas and BHP Billiton can do an excellent and safe job of transporting LNG to our coast. I do not believe that there is any threat to this proposed operation. I believe the circumstances of not doing this now will be the biggest threat to our environment. Please consider the consequences of not taking this action.

I for one would like to see this project approved.

2004/G232

G232-1

Date: 12/19/2004

First Name: Marie
Last Name: Jones

Address: 24877 Walnut st.

City: Santa Clarita

State: CA

Zip Code: 91321

Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: If there was anything that would help prevent rolling blackouts I'm all for

that. I can't remember the last time my power bill went down in price. If we don't get this natural gas thing going now I won't be able to afford power.

2004/G211

G211-1

Date: 12/18/2004

First Name: Dean

Last Name: Jordan

Address: 1550 Dakin Ave

City: Simi Valley

State: CA

Zip Code: 93065

Topic: Air Quality

Comments: I would just like to say How greatful I am to the people who have found a

way to clean up our air. Not only is this project going to save lifes but it will save us money as well. I understand that there are some risks involved but we are taking a greater risk if nothing is done about our air

quality now.

2004/G164

G164-1

Date: 12/17/2004

First Name: Jamie Last Name: Jordan

Address: 328 Houston Dr City: Thousand Oaks

State: CA

Zip Code: 91360

Topic: Alternatives

Comments: As far as I'm concerned there is no alternative. The Cabrillo Project needs

to be carried out and the sooner it is started the sooner we can all breathe, see, and feel better. I don't mind some small inconveniences;

they are well worth the bigger picture.

I'm glad and grateful for the opportunity to state my opinion. But there

should be no debate on this. BHP needs to get started.

2004/G309

G309-1